App. F. IX-4

Previous References

Mez 1 34 30 f 2

193 O.
(Mezrai)

File No. 169 30
Serial Nos. 1 – 9

Later References.

Mez 205-34-43
Mez 46-35-1-11

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 9

Part B for April 35 —

SUBJECT.

Re affairs of Sri Channabasa Swami temple at Gubbi

Do see Mez Conf
No 1393 of 26-4-35

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

Requesting him to take action under Section 6 of the Mysore Religious Charitable Institutions Inam Abolition

R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Letter of 23/10/30 from
Mr. N. Chamnaftra, Advocate
and member of the L.C. Etc.
Lubbi Complaint against
the management of the
Sri Chamundeswari Engg.
Engineering Temple etc.
Office -

(1) Pl. forward the
above to me for
original and report
thereon.

11/11/30

(2) Law Secy)

3.11.30

(3) Agreed
R. 17.4
[illegible]

12 No. 1112 of 15/11/30 forwarding
the [illegible] and [illegible]

17/11

NB.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

1 SEP 1931

Office of the Dewan of Mysore,

NOTE.

Dated *193*

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
31. AUG. 1931

GENL. & REV. SECT.
2 - SEP 1931
MUZRAI.

Serial No. 3

No 342 dt 7.9.31 to the Muzrai Commissioner calling for a report on the Social form and other suggestions given by Mr N. Channabasappa Member of the Legislative Council in the matter.

Letter No Ab1 16/31-32 dt 24.4.1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner requesting Sanction to take Sri Channabasaveswara Swamiji letter ab Gubbi under Government Management to Vest. The Name in a representative Committee of Channadasis

Dft calling for the return from Sri N. Channabasappa.

13) Issued 1/198

4

TYPI CTION. 11 AUG. 1934 GENL SECTT.

No 192 dt 14.8.34 to the Muzrai Commissr calling for the return of letter dt 23.10.30 from Mr N. Channabasappa Advocate Gubbi referred to therein.

Letter No Ab1 16/31-32 dt 22.8.1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner returning letter dt 23.10.30 from Mr N. Channabasappa of Gubbi on the abstract of Sri Channabasaveswara Swamiji &c.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 02553—G P B—50 000—8 7 30

*)

Re Assumption of the management
of Sri Channabasaveswara Swamie temple a

Mysore

File No. 116 of 1933-34

General and Revenue Secretariat

to take Sri
Channabasaveswara Swamie temple
and to be managed
under Sec. 18 of the Mysr. Regn. and vest
it in a representative Committee of
Dharmadarsis in the

MW 29/8/34

The Dy. C. in his order
dy 5-7-34 (Encl to Pub I)
has advanced reasons for coming
that the Management of Sri Chenna-
basaveshwara Swami temple be taken
over from the hands of the present
Managers and Vested in a Representative
Committee of Dharmadarsis (under
Sec 18 of the Religious & Charitable
Institutions Regulation of 1927.
It is however not clear from the Dy C's
order whether the other party
(ie the Sects & Yejamans of the
Lingayat Community of the place
in whom the Management of this
Institution had Vested from time
immemorial as stated in the preamble
of the Mcb order) were heard & afforded
an opportunity to meet the
Charges levelled against them. It is for
Govt whether the Dy C. may be
asked about this or whether this
Sanction may be accorded to take
the Institution under Govt Management

and Deputy Secretary of Govt to take the Institution under Govt Management

A

R Assumption of the management of Sri Channabasaveshwara Swamy temple at

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 193

Serial No.

as recommended by him.

5/9/34

Ch: Secy)

16 The point at issue in this appeal is whether the M.C. did not exceed his powers in ordering the removal of the Dharmadarshi and appointing the Archaka as the Dharmadarshi. The M.C. did not exceed his powers in ordering the removal of the Dharmadarshi and appointing the Archaka as the Dharmadarshi. The M.C. did not exceed his powers in ordering the removal of the Dharmadarshi and appointing the Archaka as the Dharmadarshi.

Ro

6/9/34.

5/9/34

17 Office ordered

18) Issue 5/9/1934

15/9 No 446 of 24.9.34 from the Muzrai Commissioner calling for additional information...

Letter no AM 16/31-32 of 10.10.34 from the Muzrai Commissioner furnishing the information called for.

19) The M.C. says that at the request of the Setty and Yajamans (Respondents in the case) the case was adjourned from 2/11/34 to 5/11/34 & that even on the latter date they prayed for further time - The latter was refused & the M.C & the parties were asked to file Written Statements if they liked. In response, Setty Revanna and Shivalingappa have filed their Statements. Another interested respondent viz. Yajaman Shivalingappa has not filed any statement.

20) Setty Revanna in his Statement

Note—Contn Sheet.

filed by him totally refuted allegations made against the present management of the temple & its properties.

21 Adarishakka, another respondent has written to say that the present S-W-o has completely relied on the words of his enemies, has taken a prejudiced view of the whole affairs & has reported against himself and the affairs of the Asthan. (S-W-o report of Dec 1933 is flagged U).

Earlier prior to this viz on 24/2/32 Mr. N. Sundaraja Iyengar, the then D.C. of this Dt, heard the parties in full & decided that the management might continue in the hands of Setti and Yajaman for a further period of two years & that parties to abide by the terms of the Mutchalika executed before him the question of appointing Dharmadarsi would be considered — Thereupon the Chairman of the M.C. that the above charges made against the D.C. were not properly enquired into The case was again recommended by the D.C. for a further report on the specific allegations of mismanagement — After obtaining a report from the present D.C the M.C. has sought orders to take the temple Madras & the properties endowed thereto under the management of Govt. Before doing this it is felt that it is necessary

(must be taken with the premise temple)

× Para 3

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 193 .

Serial No

that the parties be heard here, as the respondents did not have the case conducted on their behalf by the m-c & consequently the m-c refused further adjournment. [The case in fact remained unheard in the lower Court].

If this is appd, Mr. Cariappa, the original petr will be called upon to produce here Rs Stamp for his petn so that it may be treated as an appl petn before it is heard.

2 Subs both depts to parties to Suppn

From the m-c's letter dt 10.10.34 it is clear that the Govt & Yajamans were afforded opportunities to meet the charges levelled against them and that both of them have filed written Statements also. As such the order to be passed by the Govt. may be accepted and can then be carried out, as required by the Govt., to intimate the institutions under Govt. Management u/s. 62 Sec 18 of the Religious & Charitable Institutions Act of 1927 (Vide m-c's letter dt 24.7.34 - Flag Refer — Paras 15 & 16 Supra.

25/10/34

Chairman) Thereafter case to be adjourned

Ra 7/11/34

II Member

2) Sections 17 & 18 of the

P.W.D. II

PRESENTED SECOND MYSORE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL 9 NOV. 1934 No. 3325

OCT. 1934

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 0195a—GPP—22 500—12 6 34

Re:- appointment of Sri Channabasaveshwara Vadeer Jangama Swamiji of Ganglapalli

File No. of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Mun. Regns require that the Mun Officer shd institute the enquiry & that the Mun Officer may order whether the enquiry is by the Mun Offr but orders were passed by the R C Please examine & say if this is correct

16/11

27 RR 16/11/34. 16/11

Sections 17 and 18 of the current Mysore Regulation No. VII of 1927 relate to Public Religious and Charitable Institutions Other than Mysore Institutions - Regn. No. VII of 1927 - The institution in question is a Mysore one as it is in receipt of Cash grant and land grant. Hence the Regn has passed orders in the matter. Subd with regard to the cases 26. Supra.

page 5 of the Regn

x 121-1 p.a.

[The incumbent is also known as Sri Channabasava Vadeyaru Samadhi or Sri Channaviradeevaru Mutt]

x page 31 of the Cash Grant Register & Page 10 of the list of other Inams x pp 204 and 207 of the Inam Land Reg. (R)

L.S. 27/11

II Member)

Please lay out

The Asst Secy 29/11/34

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER COUNCIL 29 NOV 1934 NO

Note put it down as under Sec. 18. Not 18 under what section is the R C's order? The case has not been properly handled

RR 7/12 8/10/12

General and Revenue Secretariat — Muz File No. 169 of 1930.

Serial No.

31 Draft Hubbl. as personally instructed
Jno
17/12/34

17 DEC. 1934 GENL. & REV. SECTT

Letter no 882 of 14.12.1934 to the Muzrai Commissioner calling for information as to the Section of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation under which he proposes to take action since Section 18 of the said Regulation refers to Inam Muzrai Institution -

Letter no AM 16/31-32 of 3.1.34 from the Muzrai Commissioner stating that for reasons specified Muzrai Institutions are also public and Charitable Institutions to which Section 19 of the Regulation could be applied and stating that, the Dharmadarsis maybe appointed under Section 6 and that if Government agree Special Notes are above the records may be returned for passing orders accordingly.

As both reference to the minutes in para 30

GS 10.1.35.

Sri Channabasaveswara Swami temple at Hubli is a minor Muzrai Institution which has been throughout in the management of the Settis and Yajamans of the place.

Mr. Channappa having complained about the mismanagement of the affairs of this institution, the Deputy

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12 10-33

Serial No.

Deputy Commissioner (Mr.N.Sundararajiengar) after inspecting the institution has,in his notes of inspection dated 27th September 1931,stated that in the meeting held on that day in the temple the opinion expressed was that there was no necessity for the appointment of Dharmadarsis and that the two persons (Yejaman Devanna and Yejaman Hutchaveerappa) who have been looking after the temple for the past 28 years have agreed to continue to do so and render whatever accounts are prescribed by Government under the Muzrai Regulation. The same Deputy Commissioner in his order dated 24th February 1932 (passed in Muzrai Case No.M.868/30-31) expressed the opinion that the management of the temple might continue as heretofore in the hands of the said two persons for a further period of 2 years and in case they fail, during the period, to abide by the terms of the Mutchalika executed by them, the question of appointing Dharmadarsis might be reopened and suitable proposals submitted.

Mr.Channappa had also complained to the then Acting Dewan on 31st August 1931 and as per his orders a report had been called for from the Muzrai Commissioner. The Muzrai Commissioner sent an ad-interim reply on 22nd August 1933 that Mr.Channappa having presented a written statement before his office making allegations of mismanagement in respect of the institution, he has remanded the case to the Deputy Commissioner for a fuller enquiry on the several points adverted to therein and that a further report would be submitted after the final disposal of the case.

Serial No.

37) At the instance of the Deputy Commissioner the Sub Division Officer Mr.Abdul Hukh held an enquiry about the mismanagement of the institution and after examining 21 witnesses on behalf of the petitioner Mr.Channappa and 2 others and 3 witnesses on behalf of the counter-petitioners (Yajaman Hutchaveerappa and Yajaman Revanna Setty) and 5 independent witnesses, submitted an exhaustive report in December 1933 to the Deputy Commissioner. His finding is that the present managers have failed in their duty to manage the institution properly and that a representative committee may be appointed to manage the institution.

38) After the above report was submitted by the Deputy Commissioner to the Muzrai Commissioner, the latter officer passed an order that the management of the institution should be taken over from the hands of the present managers and vested in a representative committee and sought sanction of Government to take the institution under Government management under Sec.18 of the Muzrai Regulation.

39) The Muzrai Commissioner having been asked how he proposed action being taken under Sec.18 of the Muzrai Regulation, he has in his latest letter dated 3rd January 1935 stated that the idea was to take action under the said section, as in accordance with the view conveyed in Financial Secretary's letter dated 8th September 1930 Muzrai institutions are also public and charitable in-institutions to which sec.19 and presumably the provi-

NOTE—Contn Sheet

155—GPB—22 500—12 6 34

re. affairs of the Chaunalwasal Vyavasthapaka Sabha

7

File No. 65 of 1930. General and Revenue Secretariat

provisions of Chapter III of the Regulation could be applied; and that if this is not possible, there is no reason why Dharmadarsis should not be appointed under Sec.6 and the management of the properties regulated accordingly. The Mukhtiar Commissioner further states that if these suggestions are accepted, the records may be returned to him for passing orders accordingly.

14/2/35

II Member)

We) The M.C may as recommended by him take action first under Sec 6 as this is a Mukhtiar's

6220

6/4

6/4

6(4/35

8/4

8/4 Asst

6-5 1934

Letter No 1395 of 26.4.35 to the Mukhtiar Commissioner stating that he may take action as instructed therein.

TYPING SECTION
23. APR 1935
GENL & REV

8/5

98 8/5

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE

13 Mrg 580

Gubbi, 25-10-30

Date 23. 10. 1930

M. CHANNAPPA, B.A., B.L.,
ADVOCATE
MEMBER OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
AND TUMKUR DISTRICT BOARD

Mrg 24.10.30

Mrg 169-30-

The Muzarai Secretary
To
The Government of Mysore
Bangalore

Dear Sir,

You will be pleased to remember that I had a talk with you about the appointment of Archakas for Sree Channabasaveshwara swami temple at Gubbi. This is quite an old institution which at present is not well managed. The public is kept in darkness as to who is responsible for the financial management of the temple and its affairs. I am told that it is a minor Muzarai institution from which, if only properly managed with a view to augment its revenues, will be a fairly extensive institution. The temple owns a fairly extensive area whereon a regular Fair is held on Monday and some big & small merchants are also carrying on trade there. Some of these merchants might very well give Rs 100/- per annum as rent to the temple when I do not think that

at present "These institutions will never improve
for want of income. The temple owns certain
mantaps (stone ...) which are fast falling into
ruins and certain other people are living in
mantaps without paying any rent who
The temple archaks fight among themselves
so much so they have even filed a petition
before the Amildar. Almost all the
are its devotees Just round about the
there are the eternal dung-pits which are
a nuisance and which make the area
quite unhealthy I think that this is all
due to want of proper management
also want of funds. It would be interesting
for the Government to know or to call for
information as to what is the income and
expenditure of the temple, who is in charge
of the institution and who, if any, has main-
tained any accounts. I am quite certain
that if people of various communities are
representative
as dharmadharsis, they will be saddled
with the proper management of the insti-

16

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

19

Cubb, 193

Date

N. CHANNAPPA, B.A., B.L.,
ADVOCATE
MEMBER OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
AND TUMKUR DISTRICT BOARD

by keeping regular accounts of its income and expenditure and they will improve the financial resources, so that they may be able to restore the mantaps as well as better the surroundings from the sanitary point of view. My own request is that the government might be pleased to hasten this matter, so that the public might have the benefit or the fortune, as the case may be, of the early realisation of what I have set forth above.

Yours Sincerely
N. Channappa

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No 1112 Jud on

Mis 169-3 --- 2-5-11

The accompanying Petition Registered

No. 580 dated 23.10.30

received at the General and Revenue

Secretariat from Hss. N. Channappa

Advocate and member of the

K.C. Etc Kubbi making certain suggestions regarding the management of the Sri Channabasaveswara Swami temple at Ilkal

Mark

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~

to the M.C.

.....

.....for favourable report.

By Order,

3.11.30

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

.....19.....

[P. T. O.

WD 02048 -GPB—3750—8 8-28

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ,..... ....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

... . .ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟು.

....

. .. .

. ...

....

.. ..

....

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ....

ಮುಕ್ತಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು.. .....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

....

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

No 372 . dt 7.4.31
Revenue 169-30-3

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Subject :- Repairs to the Sri Channabasaveswaraswami temple at Gubbi and arrangements for its better management.

In continuation of this office Memo No.1112 dated 15th November 1930 calling for a report on the subject, I am directed to state that Mr.N.Channappa,Member of the Legislative Council has ~~gixx~~ since represented to the Dewan as follows :-

(1) that the income of the temple which is stated to be a Muzrai institution is capable of improvement but that no steps are taken to increase it.

(2) that the place is not kept clean and the building needs repairs.

(3) that it has no Board of Dharmadarsis and it is necessary to to appoint one.

I am to request you to be so good as to submit very early a report on the above points and on the other suggestions if any made in the petition of 23rd October 1930.

The petition may kindly be returned with your reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

V Subrahmanyasastri

For Financial Secretary to Government.

18

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 7.9.31

Signed by Mrs V.S.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Mucz

File No. 169-30

Serial No. 3

No. 372

To

The Mucz Comm

Sir,

Subject:- Repairs ~~Improvements~~ to the Sri Channabasaveswara swamin temple at Gubbi and arrangements for its better management.

In continuation of this Office memo No. 1112 dated 15-11-30 calling report on the subject, I am directed to state that Mr M. Channappa

[over]

has been represented to the Dewan as follows:—

(1) That the income of the temple which is stated to be a Mugrai institution is capable of improvement but that no steps are taken to increase it.

(2) That the place is not kept clean and the building needs repairs.

(3) That it has no Board of Dharmadarsis and it is necessary to appoint one.

I am to request you to be so good as to submit very early a report on the above points and on the other suggestions if any made in the petition of 23-10-30.

The petition may kindly be returned with your reply.

I have etc

21/4/31

Hy 24/4/31
for Jt Secy

Mr. R.S.

.....



Subject:- [illegible] for the [illegible]



[illegible] to your [illegible] No.821/30-31 dated 15-9-31 [illegible] the [illegible], I have to say that the [illegible] Jute Cess [illegible] up to 31-8-1931. The cess grants proposed for expenditure on [illegible] up to 30-9-1931. The report will be submitted in the first week of [illegible] next year.

.....

I.C.A.O.

821/30-31. 22/10/31.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Secretary to the Govt. of India, Financial Department with reference to his D.O. [illegible] No.310/Jute. dated 3-10-1931.

[signature]
for Secretary, Commerce Department.

Submitted for perusal

29/10

29.10.31

M. C. 13]

No. P.C. 179/30-31

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore, 17th March 1932

From

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.I.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

Subject:- Management - Sri Chennabasaveswaraswami temple at Gubbi - appointment of Dharmadarsis.

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No.1112 Muz. 119-30-2 dated 15th November 1930 on the above subject, I have the honor to forwa herewith copy of Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letter No.R.Dis.M.868/30-3 dated 24th February 1932, together with copies of its enclosures and to state that Mr. N. Channappa, Advocate, has preferred an appeal to this office against the Deputy Commissioner's order on the disposal of which a final report will be submitted to Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent on leave)

Letter No .868/30-31 dated 24th February 1932 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Appointment of Dharmadarsis to Gubbi Sri Chennabasaveswara Swami temple.

In reply to your communications - Nos.P.C.179/30-31 dated 28th - October 1930 and 821/30-31 dated 27-11-30 on the subject noted above, I have the honor to forward herewith for your information copy of my --- order in the matter together with a copy of the inspection note of the temple. The order disposes of the question of the appointment of the Dharmadarsis for the present.

As regards the improvement of the resources of the temple, this has been pointed out in my inspection note and the Sub Division Officer has been requested to submit proposals in due course in consultation - with the Amildar, the leading gentlemen of the place and the temple -- officials. When I visited the temple, it was kept clean and tidy. The petitions are herewith returned.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Notes of Inspection of Sri Chennabasaveswaraswami temple otherwise known as Gubbiyappa Temple at Gubbi on the 27th September 1931.

Inspected Gubbi Sri Chennabasaveswaraswami temple this morning, with the ildar, Mr. Chennappa, B.A., B.L., Advocate, the temple officials and the other eading gentlemen of the place. The temple lands were also inspected. The ejaman and the Stanik were also present. The valuable jewels have all been laced in the Taluk Treasury only recently under the orders of the Sub Division fficer and the total value of the jewels in the custody of the Stanik of the emple is said to be about Rs.1000/-

The temple is in a tolerably good condition, but the following items require repairs:-

1. Car-shed on the right side of the temple
2. Pond on the left side of the temple, and the
3. Mantaps surrounding.

A scale for Rs.361/- has been sanctioned for this temple in the year - 1930. It provides for a Government grant of Rs.121-1-0 per annum. The Government Grant is being spent but the scale is not in force as no accounts have been furnished by the temple authorities.

The following lands are in the khate of the temple ;-

Old & Re.S.No.	Extent.	No.of trees	Remarks.
77/96	0-18	8	They are not inam lands but kharab topes.
78/97	5-23	61	
82/100	1-35	-	
80/101	1-12	-	
79/102	1- 2	-	
90/103	1-30	-	
91/104	2-24	53	
89/124	1-26	-	

The temple is situated in S.No.103. S.Nos.96 & 97 are used as Shandy grounds and it contains some temporary and permanent structures. S.No.100 is in the enjoyment of Adaviswami. S.No.124 has been leased out for 5 maunds of oil. S.No.103, barring the area on which the temple stands, is in the enjoyment of the stanik who grows flower plants etc., thereon for worship. It contains some cocoanut trees also.

The temple has the following puduvat endowments also :-

Name of donor.	Amount of endowment.	How invested.	Annual interest.	Remarks
1. Lakkenahalli Muddarajanna.	Rs.2000/ 259-1-5	5 P.C. Loan of 1955 In S.B.deposits	100/-	Huvvinaseva in Karthika Bahula Amavasya.
2. Gubbi Hutchiah, Tumkur	300	5 P.C.Loan of 1955	15	for Sankramanaseva.
	1150	6¼ P.C.loan of 1940	71-14-0	
	81-13-9	In S.B. Deposits		
3. Siddanna bin Gubbanna	73-0-0	do	3- 6-0	for Deeparadhana

The

The money is drawn by the Amildar and disbursed to the Yajaman for special services for which they are intended.

Jatra in connection with this temple is held once a year when taxes are levied on shops. Cattle also gather on the occasion and the manure collected then is stated to be sold. The resources of the temple are -- capable of improvement. At the meeting held this morning in the temple, this point was conceded by all who were present and they have agreed - i.e., the Stanik, Yejaman and the leading gentlemen of the place - to help the Amildar to suggest proposals for improvements. If that is done, the temple might have an assured income of not less than Rs.1000/-. The opinion at the meeting was that there was no necessity for the appointment of Dharmadarsis. The Sub Division Officer will go into the matter in detail in consultation with the Amildar and the temple officials and the leading gentlemen of the place and submit proposals in due course.

There has been no Setty for some years past the last incumbent having died 8 years ago. The Yejaman's duties are being carried on with regard to this temple by two persons viz., Messrs. Hutchaveerappa and --- Revanna. They have been looking after the duties for the past 28 years and they have agreed to continue to do so and to render whatever accounts are prescribed by Government under the Muzrai Regulation in future.

(Sd.) N.S.Iyengar,
Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

In The Court Of The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

Dated Camp-Turuvekere, 24th February 1932. 25

Muz. Case No. M.868/30-31

Present:- M. Sundararaja Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

P e t i t i o n e r s.-

1. Gubbi Yejaman Revanna & 2. Yejaman Hutchaveerappa

O p p o n e n t s.-

Messrs. N. Chennappa, Phousedar Revanna & others.

Subject:- Appointment of a committee of Dharmadersees to supervise the affairs of the temple of Sri Chennabasaveswarasvami at Gubbi.-

FACTS OF THE CASE.

There have been disputes in regard to the management of the affairs of this temple between the Staniks and the Setty and Yejaman of Gubbi Town since 1871.

The matter was settled in 1884 by the then General Assistant Commissioner, Mr, B. G. Krishnaiengar, who ordered that the Staniks should manage the internal affairs of the temple while the Setty and Yejaman should look to the external side of it.

The trouble revived again in 1923. The Amildar went into the matter and recorded an order dated 16th July 1923 wherein he observed that necessary steps should be taken in the matter of appointment of Dharmadersees.

The matter went up to the Sub Division Officer who passed a final order on 11-1-25. He was of the opinion that there was no necessity to appoint Dharmadersees as suggested by the Amildar in his order of 16th July 1923, that the Staniks should look after the internal management of the temple as heretofore, while the Setty and Yejaman should be considered as the managers of the institution.

A recommendation was made to the Muzrai Commissioner on 10th September 1925 in the matter of the appointment of Setty and Yejaman as the sole Dharmadersees of the temple for reasons mentioned in the communication and for fixing a scale of income and expenditure. The income was shown to be more than Rs.1000/- a year. The Muzrai Commissioner observed that except the Cash Grant of Rs.121/- which was

was a sure income, the other items required verification, as the value of donations in kind could not be counted upon as a certainty. He also observed that provision had to be made in the scale for the ' Muzrai - Establishment Fund and for Reserve

In 1930, the Deputy Commissioner sanctioned a scale of income and expenditure for this temple, for Rs.361-1-0. This scale is reported to have been suggested by the Amildar and the Sub Division Officer Gubbi, in consultation with Mr. G. Murigappa a leading gentleman of the Lingayet community at Gubbi. Thus the temple became a Minor Muzrai Institution.

After the scale was sanctioned, the Amildar through the Sub Division Officer, submitted a list of Dharmadersees for approval to the Deputy Commissioner. This was on 2-10-30. Thereupon the petitioners protested to the Deputy Commissioner against the appointment of Dharmadersees. In the meanwhile the opponent(Mr.N.Chennappa)petitioned the Muzrai Commissioner alleging mismanagement of the temple affairs by the petitioners and suggesting the appointment of a committee of Dharmadersees for its better management. This was sent to this Office for report with the observation that steps might be taken for the appointement of Dharmadersees if they had not been appointed already. Thereupon Mr. N. Chennappa was also - brought on file, a notice was issued to him to appear and argue his case. He filed a Questionaire - a copy of which was furnished to the Counsel for the petitioner for being answered. Their answers togetherwith the objections of Mr. N. Chennappa to their answers, are all in the record. - Mr. Chennappa gave a petition to the Financial Secretary to Goverment of Mysore which was also forwarded to this office for report by the Muzrai Commissioner.

The temple was inspected by the Deputy Commissioner on 27th September 1931 when the Amildar, Mr. N. Chennappa, the temple officials, the petitioners and their Advocates and other leading gentlemen of the place - were present. In November 1931, Mr. K. Rangaiengar filed a petition on behalf of Phousedar Revanna and others of Gubbi praying that as the petitioners were ' bhaktas ' of the God in the temple, they might also be added as parties. Mr. V. G. Narasimhiah appeared for the defendants and Mr. K. Rangaiengar for Phousedar Revanna and others. Mr. Chennappa was heard in person. The written arguments of Messrs. V. Rangaiengar and N.

Chennappa

Chennappa were also filed after they were heard.

O R D E R.

There is no doubt that the temple is a Muzrai Institution. This is conceded by both the parties. The only point that has arisen for disposal is whether a committee of Dharmadersees should be appointed for the temple under Rule 6 (2) of the Rules under the Mysore Religious and Charitable Regulations of 1927 or whether the institution should be entrusted to the management of the petitioners as sole Dharmadersees. A copy of my inspection note which is attached to the order as an enclosure shows the present position and resources of the temple. There has been no Setty for some years past, the last incumbent having died 8 years ago. The Yejaman's duties are being carried on by the petitioners for the past 28 years. All the people who were present at the meeting excepting the opponent(Mr.T. Chennappa)did not favour the idea of appointment of Dharmadersees. They were emphatically against it. They were for the continuance of the management of the temple in the hands of the petitioners. In the Mutchalika that they have executed before me, they have agreed to work the sanctioned scale, suggest proposals for improving the resources of the temple and to furnish accounts as prescribed by the Regulation. Mr. Chennappa stood there by himself. He had not one single supporter. It was clear to me that the proposal for appointment of Dharmadersees did not find any favour with any devotees of the temple. In the communication made to the Muzrai Commissioner my predecessor Mr. K. V. Anantharaman(No. Muz. 1/16-17 dated 10th September 1925), it is stated that it is better to have the management in the hands of the Yejaman and Pete Setty as the people seem to have full faith in them, they being considered as the sole Dharmadersees of the institution. In these circumstances, I am of opinion that the management of the temple might continue as heretofore in the hands of the petitioners for a further term of two years. If during this period they fail to abide by the terms of the Mutchalika executed before the Deputy Commissioner, the matter of appointment of Dharmadersees might be reopened and suitable proposals submitted by the Amildar and the Sub Division Officer.

" COPY "
By Commissioner

Sd/- T. S. Iyengar,
Deputy Commissioner.

No. Appl 16 Rev 31-32

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Bangalore,..... 16th August..... *1933*. 22

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.



To

A. N. Raghavachar, Esq., M.A.,

Offg. *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,

F..i..n..a..n..c..i..a l...*Department.*



ith reference to your D.O. reminder No.168/Muz.169-30 dated 11-8-33 re: management of the affairs of Sri Channabasaveswaraswamy temple at Gubbi, I have the honor to forward herewith for favour of information copy of this office letter No.App.16/31-32 dated 14-3-33 addressed to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, remanding the case for a fuller enquiry on the several points adverted to therein, and to state that a further report will be submitted to Government after the final disposal of the case in this office. The Deputy Commissioner has also been

asked to expedite his reply

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

The receipt of a further report will, if asked, be awaited.

28/8

28/8/33

25/8/33

25/8

2614

Letter No. Ap..lo/61-6? dated 14-3-65 from the Muzrai Commissione Mysore to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

With reference to your order in Muzrai Case No. M.806/3 -61 dated 6-6-?6, I have the honor to state that Mr. M. Channappa, B.A., L.L.B., Gubbi has presented a written statement before this office making allegations of mismanagement in respect of the Sri Channabasaveswaraswami te in Gubbi. He complains that the allegations made before the Deputy C missioner were not properly enquired into.

From the records it is seen that your predecessor, Mr. Sundararaj Iyengar visited Gubbi, heard the statements of Mr. Channappa and other persons who are now responsible for the mana ement of the temple, and came to the conclusion tha there was no reason just now to disturb th existing management or to appoint Dharmadarsis under the Religious and Charitable Endowments Regulation.

3. A reference to the records shows that Mr. Channappa has made spec allegations of mismanagement, viz., for instance,

(i) That no interest is received and seva (Karthika) performed regard to the loan of Rs.11 /- advanced to Gubbi Settara Putchappasani out of the Tuduvat funds of the temple.

(ii) That no interest is received and seva (Pourrima) performed regard to the loan of Rs.477-7-4 advanced to Stanik Putcha out of the Tuduvat funds of the tem le.

(iii) That no interest is received and seva (Mangal arthi) perfor in regard to the loan of Rs.100/- advanced to Akkanasani of the Tuduvat funds of the temple.

Reference may also be made to the allegations in paragraphs 7 and of the "Objections to answers" filed by Mr. Channappa before you on 17 March 1961 regarding the Dhandi Collections, ground rent, etc. Mr Channappa offers to substantiate these and other allegations and i is therefore necessary that a proper enquiry should be held. T herefor request that you will direct the Sub Division O ficer o hold an enqui in regard to each specific and material allegations of mismanagement by Mr, Channappa and record his conclusion after givin n o portunit both parties to adduce evidence.

4. It is also seen from the records th the income of the tem le i ceptible of improvement and that there exists no regular scal . This matter also requires attention. After the conclusion of the records may be submitted to this office with your recommendations on the points raised in the enquiry as well as on the fi

Прилепина

mth.

Apl 16 Rve 37
31-32

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 5th July 1934.

24
37



FROM

N. MADHAVA RAU, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore

To

S. Shamanna, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department.

R/2577

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No.1112/Muz. 119-30-2 dated 15-11-1930, calling for a report on the petition of Mr. N. Channappa re: management of the Sri Channabasaveswaraswami temple at Gubbi, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of my order No.App.16/31-32 dated 5th July 34 together with the connected records and to request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained to take the institution under Government management under Section 18 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation of 1927 and vesting it in a representative Committee of Dharmadarsis.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

N M Shamanna

Muzrai Commissioner.

Order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Reference:-

Appeal Petition dated 11-3-1932 of N. Channappa against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, in respect of the alleged mismanagement of Sri Channabasaveswaraswami temple at Gubbi.

2. Letter No.M.1760/31-32 dated 14-12-1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, submitting the Sub Division Officer's detailed report of enquiry in the matter and stating that the latter officer's suggestions with regard to the future management of Sri Channabasaveswaraswami temple may be accepted.

Order No. Bangalore dated 5th July 1934.

The temple of Sri Channabasaveswara Swami at Gubbi is a minor Muzrai institution. The records show that the management of this institution has been vested from time immemorial in the Setty and the Yejamans of the Lingayet community of the place. This mamool was recognised in 1884 by the then Deputy Commissioner according to whose orders the Setty and Yejaman are held responsible for the administration of the Puduvat funds and the conduct of the respective sevas.

2. The allegations of mismanagement made by the appellant may be briefly summed up as follows:-

(i) Non-performance of endowment sevas.

(ii) Mismanagement of the temple property .

(iii) Misappropriation of the income of the temple by the Setty and Yejamans of the place who are the present managers of the institution or by the staniks (archaks).

(iv) Non-maintenance of accounts of income and expenditure.

3. As regards the endowment sevas, it is reported that there are in all 23 sevas for which a total sum of Rs 3087-0-1 has been paid by the devotees. It is stated that in some cases the original utsavas for which the donations were made, have been replaced by others and some of the sevas have been completely stopped. The endowment amounts appear to have been entrusted to private persons in some cases. The present managers are reported to have taken no action either to enforce the liability of the persons either to perform the sevas or to pay back the puduvat fund in their hands, with the result that the bonds executed by the latter have in some cases become time-barred involving loss to the institution.

4. As regards the property of the temple, it is seen from the khetwar patr ke that the marginally noted lands have been granted by Government to the temple free of assessment for purposes of a tope and they have either been brought

Gubbi Kasaba	Extent
S.No.	A. G.
96	0 18
97	5 23
00	1 35
01	1 12
02	1- 2

S.No.	Extent. A. G.
103	1-30
104	2-24
124	1-26
	16-10

under cultivation or used as Shandy ground. It appears from the sketch that the S. Nos. are all contiguous. The Sub Division Officer reports that Adaviswami Mutt which is a private institution has been allowed to be constructed on S.No.100 belonging to the temple some 50 years ago and that a garden containing about 50 cocoanut trees, betel vines etc., situated in the same S.No. is in the enjoyment of that Mutt. No dasoha is conducted in the Mutt as alleged by the respondents. S.No.124 has become a vegetable garden having a permanent water supply and has been leased out for a very small gutta of 3 maunds of oil per year. The cocoanut trees behind the temple in S.No.103 have been leased out permanently for Rs6/- per annum which is utilised by the archak himself unauthorisedly. S.No.104 contains 10 cocoanut and 20 hippe trees; but they have been badly neglected. Weekly shandy is held in S.Nos.96, 97, 102 and 104 belonging to the temple and some mantaps and buildings have been unauthorisedly constructed therein by several Lingayet merchants of Gubbi, but no ground-rent is regularly levied on stalls shops etc., in the shandy. The Mandy merchants and temple servants are appropriating the proceeds of the manure collected on Shandy days. The Sub Division Officer states that the Municipal Council is agreeable to pay Rs800/ to the temple if it is given a fairly long lease of the shandy area and is permitted to take the realisation from the manure. The Council is also said to be willing to permit the temple authorities to collect shop tax etc., and to appropriate the income from the manure during the Jatra week.

5. Large sums were collected for the new temple car and ground rent was levied for some years during the annual jatra but no accounts have been kept till now by the Setty and Yejaman (present managers) for the amount collected and spent.

6. From the facts stated above, it has to be concluded that the charges have been substantiated and that there has been a mismanagement justifying action under Section 18 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation. The records further disclose that non-Lingayet communities are devotees of the temple having contributed liberally for its improvement, but have no voice in its management.

7. The management of the institution, will, in the circumstances, be taken over from the hands of the present managers and vested in a representative Committee of Dharmadarsis. Action should be taken by the Deputy Commissioner

Commissioner to restore possession of S.No.100 to the temple from the Adavi Mutt Swami who has been in unauthorised possession of it and to lease out this as well as the other lands under cultivation to the best advantage of the institution. The right of collecting rents in the shandy grounds including the permanent structures should also be sold, the Deputy Commissioner having the discretion to accept the terms offered by the Municipality or to sell the right in public auction. As regards puduvat funds such of them as would be recovered should be recovered and fresh bonds obtained in the case of others and the amounts that have become irrecoverable on account of the negligence and omission of the managers should be made good by them. The sevas for which the endowments were originally made may be incorporated in the scale to be drawn up.

8. A copy of this order will be submitted to Government for sanction under Section 18 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation and effect given to it after receipt of such sanction.

Muzrai Commissioner.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning records.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHN

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. ~~H~~ 192 Muz — *Dated, Bangalore,* 11th August 193 4. 14

From

The *Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.Apl 16/31-32 dated 24th July 1934 in the matter of bringing Sri Channabasa-veswara Swami temple at Gubbi under the management of - Government, I am directed to request you to be so good as to return letter dated 23rd October 1930 from Mr.N. Channappa, Advocate and Member of the Legislative Council at Gubbi which was forwarded to you in original for a - report with this Office letter No.1112 dated 15th Novemb-er 1930 as the same has not been received here.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Financial Secretary to Govt.

c.n.-3

ppe dix F G—1]

JBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mez

File No.

Serial No.

Mary No. of letter replied to 94

No. 192

To

The L.C

Sir,

With reference to your letter

No A57 16

in the matter of printing of Sri

Channabasaveswara Swamis

Jathre at Gubbi under the management

of Govt, I am directed to

request you

to return letter of 23.10.30 ~~in original~~

from Sri N. Channappa Advocate

Member of the L.C. at Gubbi which

was forwarded to you in original

with a report vide this

office No 112 of 15/11/30. As the Govt

records returned with your letter

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 14/8/34

Signed by K B Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34

Same has with them with them. ~~Have~~
~~Have advance for delivery~~
~~have if you can return~~

38

Thank you

2/10/8

For Peace

G8
9/8/24

W

39

No. Apl 16/31-32 Encl One

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, ... 193

GENL & REV. SECRETARIAT
27 AUG 1934
MUZRAI BRANCH

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAU, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

[illegible]

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
..... *Department*

8/258

SIR,

[illegible]

I have the honour to [illegible]
October 193[illegible]
desired in your letter [illegible] 193[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

N. Madhava Rau

40

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

D. O. No. 446 Dated, Bangalore 20th September 1934.

Mis 169-30 & 34 dt 24 Oct

Subject:- Re. Management of the temple of Sri Channabasaveswaraswami at Gubbi.

Dear Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. Appl.16/31-32, dated 22nd August 1934 on the above subject, I am desired to enquire if the Setty and Yejamans of the Lingayet community of Gubbi in whom the management of the Institution had vested from time immemorial as stated in the 1st para of your order dated 5th July 1934 were heard and afforded an opportunity to meet the charges levelled against them. The entire records received from you are herewith returned for reference and retransmission.

Yours sincerely,

B Muddenahalli

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

)endix F G—1]

41

BJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mis

File No. 169 - 30

Serial No.

No. 446 Revenue 3 & Ms

iary No. of letter replied to .....

To

The M. C

Subj:- Re Management of the Temple of Sri Channabasaveshwara Swami at Gubbi

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 2-9-34

Signed by B Muddukrishnappa

Dear Sir

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. A&I 46/31-32 dt 22/8/34 on the above subject, I am directed to request you to exercise the powers of Executive Officer vested in the Secretary and Treasurer of the Temple

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

Case 2. mitk

The Management of the Instn
from whom
has been in memorial
as stated in the 8th para
of your order of 5/7/34
were heard and afforded an opportunity
sought
~~to which you have~~
~~Access to enable them~~
to seek
approval, to
the charges levelled against
them. The entire records received
from you are perused & returned
herewith for reference & retransmission

Yours faithfully
19/9/34
For Chief

G.S
18/9 W

M C [illegible]
No Apl 16/31-32
Rec'd records.

GEN. SECRETARIAT 444 12 OCT 1934 MUZRAI BRANCH MYSORE

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER, 43

Dated, Bangalore, 6th October *193* 4

10.

Mcg 169 - 30

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

R. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

GENL SECT. Muz 10 OCT. 1934

SIR,

Appeal - Mr. N. Channappa - Management of Sri Channabasaveswaraswamy temple at Gubbi.

With reference to correspondence ending with your D.O. No.446/Muz.169-30 dated 24-9-1934 enquiring whether the Setty and Yejamans of the Lingayet Community of Gubbi were given an opportunity to meet the charges made against them, I have the honor to state that the case had been posted to the marginally mentioned dates and detailed

2nd April 1934: notices containing the charges were issued to the
5th June 1934: Setty (Revanna), Yejaman (Hutchaveerappa) and Adaviswami. At the request of the respondents the case was adjourned from 2nd April 1934 to 5th June 1934 and even on the latter date the Yejaman and Adaviswami who were present, prayed for further time. Further adjournment was refused and the parties were asked to present written statements if they liked. In response thereto, Yejaman Revanna and Adaviswami filed written statements (enclosed) on 15th June 1934 and 16th June 1934 respectively. As the respondents failed to satisfactorily explain the charges against them, the order under reference was passed by me.

The connected records are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.



MEMO OF POINTS TO BE URGED IN THE MUZROI APPEAL:-

1. Only the Veerashiva community people are the devotees of the temple. All the temple moveable properties are the gifts made by only the Veerashaivas and all the sevas are carried out by the Veerashivas.

2. The jewels, clothes and vessels beloning to the temple are in the custody of Mr.Hutchappa, the Archak. There is a list of them maintained in the Taluk Office. They are inspected by the Amildar as often as possible.

3. There is no specific source of income to the temple. The cash grant of Rs.121-1-0 is utlised for the performance of daily Deeparadhana etc., This sum is got each month by the Archak from the Taluk after furnishing details of expenditure.

4. The so called Inam land for the temple includes the open land around the temple and the area on which the shandy is held and also the land on which several mantapas and the Sri Adaviswami Mutt are built. The whole extent is about 15 acres. About 1½ acres containing a few Hippe and other trees in the temple lands have been let out for 3 maunds of oil per year for the use of the temple. The Archak is responsible for the receipt and the expenditure of the same. There are about 30 fruit bearing cocoanut trees which were grown by the late Sri Adaviswami in his Mutt premises. The produce of these trees is taken by the people of the Adaviswami's Mutt for the expenses of the "Dasha" (the daily feeding of the people). There are about 20 Hippe trees in the temple premises which yield no produce.

There are 4 tamarind trees two of which are in the Sri Adaviswami Mutt premises and the other two in the temp premises? The yield which is very little is used for the Mutt and the temple purposes. There are two flower gardens for getting flowers for temple worship. The gardener who gets no seperate pay is allowed to enjoy the fruits of 5 cocoanut trees behind the temple. The are about 8 cocoanut trees behind the kalyani which yi no fruits. There are no other fruit bearing trees.

5. The endowments given for the temple i.e., th late Gubbi Huchanna's Rs.1000/- and Sagarada Siddappa' Rs.75 are deposited in the Government Savings Bank - Account with directions that certain sevas should be - carried out by the managers. The other pudvits are - lent out to private men by the pudivitdars themselves to carry out certain sevas in their name out of the interest realised. These are supervised by the - managers. The sevas are regularly carried out. As the object of the pudivitdars is being fulfilled there seems to be no need for recovering the amount from the borrowers and crediting the same in the treasury. The documents executed by these people are in the Taluk - Office. The total amount may come up to Rs.2400/-. Necessary steps may be taken for the renewal of these documents if necessary.

6. A shandy on an ordinary scale is held every Monday on the Inam land. No income is derived from - this to the temple.

7. The cattle manure that is collected during the Jatra time is sold by public auction by Government

and the proceeds credited to the temple funds. The manure that is collected on shandy days is being - given to the sweepers of the temple premises as - remuneration to them for their services. The sale of the right of collecting the manure every Monday will not bring hundreds of rupees of income for - the temple. This income will not even suffice to pay for the sweeping staff that will have to be - maintained. This has been settled by an order of the Amildar Mr.Subba Rao.

8. No kanike is received in the temple and no money in the form of subscriptions have ever been collected.

9. Some Mantapas are falling into ruins. The insanitation etc., steps have been taken by the - managers in bring this fact to the notice of the - authorities concerned so that proper action might be taken to prevent it.

10. There has been no mismanagement by the - present respondents and the order made by the - Deputy Commissioner is correct. The Respondent - prays that the appeal be dismissed.

ನ 29 ರಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕಂಡಿಷನ್.

1576/34

RESPONDENT.

47

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 17th December 1934

No. 282
Mg 169-30

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.App.16/31-32 dated 10th October 1934 re. management of Sri Channabasaveswaraswamy temple at Gubbi, I am directed to request you to be so good as to state under what section of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation you propose to take action in the matter as indicated by you, since section 18 of the said Regulation refers to non-muzrai institution and the institution in question which also probably known as Sri Channabasaveswara Swamith and Channakeshavadevara Mutt is a muzrai institution.

The favour of an early reply is requested.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Chief Secretary to Government.

ide page 51 of the Cash rant Register and page 10 f the list of Muzrai nstitutions; also pages 06 and 207 of the Inam and register).

mk.3

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mes3
File No. 169-30
Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 882 with records

To

The MC

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Sir,

Date of issue 17-12-34

With reference to the correspondence ending with yr letter No. Apl 16/31-32 dy 10-10-1934 re management of Sri Channabasaveswara Swamy Temple at Gubbi, I am directed to request yr to be so good as to state under what section of the Religious & Charitable Institutions Regulation, yr purpose to take action in the matter as indicated by yr, since section 18 of the said Regulation refers to non-Muzrai institutions & the institution in question is

Signed by Mr B Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 0677 —G PB —15,000—3-11-35

Which is also known as Sri Channabasavaswami (X)
Samadhi
~~Samadhi~~ & Channamadevana Mutt
is a Murrai institution

The Income of our Estate
is regarded

(X) (Vide page 31 of the Cash grant Register & page 10 of list of Muz institutions; also pages 206 & 207 of the Inam land Register)

I have &
17/12
for chief Sy

Mer 169-30 6

No. Apl 16 Evel Records
31-32

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

52

Dated Bangalore, the 1st January *19*34

385

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
785
8 JAN 1935
MUZRAI

FROM

~~M. MADHAVA RAU, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

SECRETARIAT
Mucs
3 JAN 1935
8 1/35

Rajasevasakta
R. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

Subject:- Management of Sri Chennabasaveswaraswami temple at Gubbi.

With reference to your letter No. 882/Muz.169-30 dated 17th December 1934 re: the above, I have the honour to state that the institution in question is a minor Muzrai institution and the idea was to take action under Section 18 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation. In this connection, I invite reference to the Financial Secretary's letter No. 474/Muz 449-28-2 (134-30) dated 8-9-1930 printed at page 98 of the Muzrai Manual. According to the view communicated therein Muzrai institutions are also public and charitable institutions to which Section 19 (and presumably other provisions of Chapter III) of the Regulation could be applied. But if this is not possible, I see no reason why Dharmadarsis should not be appointed under Section 6 and the management of the several properties regulated in the manner suggested under the powers of control vested in Government in respect of all Muzrai institutions.

✓Should any of the parties affected, such as the Agavi Swami, refuse to hand over possession of the land in their enjoyment, it may be necessary to hold an enquiry and deal with the matter under Section 19 but this need not be anticipated in the present order.

3 If Government agree generally with the above suggestions, the records may be returned to me for passing orders.

orders accordingly.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

K V Amantaramaiya
Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

S 4

No 1395- Muz 169-30 Dated, Bangalore, 23rd April 1935

Home Records. 26 a

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.Apl.16/31-32 dated 3rd January 1935 regarding the management of Sri Channabasaveswara Swami Temple at Gubbi, I am directed to state that you may, as recommended by you, take action first under Section 6 of the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation No.VII of 1927, as the institution in question is a Muzrai Institution.

The records received with your letter dated 3rd January 1935 are returned herewith as desired.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S.R.2

for Chief Secretary to Government.

WD 0677 —G P B—15,000—9 11 33

F G—1]

ECT .....

. ...

.....

Schues

Section Mucy

File No. 169-30

Serial No. 9

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 1355—Income & Records

To

The D.C.

Sir,

Date of issue 26/4/35

Signed by B. Muddukrishnappa.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. A&R 16/31-32 dated 1.3.35 re: The management of Sri Channabasaveshwara Swami temple at Gubbi, I am directed to state that you may, as recommended by you take action first under Section 6 of the Mysore Religious & Charitable Institutions Regulation No VII of 1927, as the institution is grati...

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Mrs Lush 8/10/35
Shares Etc
Robert Lee